



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

grass of the preceding year; this year's growth having just well commenced."

The eggs seem to differ in appearance from any of the same genus that I have seen, and may be thus described: Creamy white, finely speckled all over the surface with reddish brown, and also marked with larger spots of the same color, more heavily at the larger ends. There are also a number of spots of light lilac, which are not conspicuous. They measure $.57 \times .48$; $.65 \times .46$; $.59 \times .47$; $.61 \times .46$.

The nest is small and loosely constructed, being quite flat. It is composed outwardly of a few leaves, a little moss and a good deal of fine grass, lined only with the latter material.

The nest was situated on the ground in and arched over with dry grass, and no bush or twigs were near. The eggs contained small embryos.—J. PARKER NORRIS, JR., *Philadelphia, Pa.*

Connecticut Warbler and Philadelphia Vireo at Shelter Island, N. Y.—On Sept. 12, 1901, I took a specimen of the Connecticut Warbler (*Geothlypis agilis*) and on the 18th another, and on the same day a specimen of the Philadelphia Vireo (*Vireo philadelphia*); the first one taken here in over twenty years' collecting, and a new record, I believe for eastern Long Island. This bird was feeding in a young growth of wild cherry trees in an old overgrown field in company with some Red-eyed and White-eyed Vireos—a sort of family gathering.—W. W. WORTHINGTON, *Shelter Island Heights, N. Y.*

Toxostoma vs. Harporhynchus.—*Toxostoma* was first used by Rafinesque (Amer. Monthly Mag., IV, p. 107) in 1818, for a genus of shells. The name occurs in a mere list of shells as "TOXOSTOMA, N. G. 1 species," and is a pure *nomen nudum*. It remained in this state until Nov., 1831 (Enumeration and Account of Some Remarkable Natural Objects in the Cabinet of Professor Rafinesque in Philadelphia, p. 2), when the species was described. Shortly before this, however (Isis, May, 1831, 528), Wagler used the term for a genus of birds (type: *Toxostoma vetula* Wagler, = *Orpheus curvirostris* Swainson), and there seems to be no valid reason why *Toxostoma* should not replace *Harporhynchus*, the latter given in 1847 by Cabanis, on the supposition that *Toxostoma* was preoccupied. Our Thrashers should stand as follows: *Toxostoma rufa* (Linn.), *Toxostoma longirostris sennetti* (Ridgw.), *Toxostoma curvirostris* (Swains.), *Toxostoma curvirostris palmeri* (Coues), *Toxostoma bendirei* (Coues), *Toxostoma cinereu* (Xantus), *Toxostoma cinerea mearnsi* (Anthony), *Toxostoma rediviva* (Gamb.), *Toxostoma rediviva pasadenensis* (Grinnell), *Toxostoma lecontei* Lawr., *Toxostoma lecontei arenicola* (Anthony), and *Toxostoma crissalis* Henry.—CHAS. W. RICHMOND, *Washington, D. C.*

Hylemathrous vs. Troglodytes for the House Wren.—In 'The Birds of Massachusetts' (p. 92) Mr. G. M. Allen and I used *Hylemathrous* for the

generic name of the House Wren for reasons then in our estimation out of place to explain. In its adoption, however, we followed the accepted methods of scientific nomenclature.

Vieillot was first to separate Wrens from Warblers when he in 1807 (*Hist. Naturelle des Oiseaux*, p. 52) restricted the name *Troglodytes* to the true Wrens, including the European Wren (*Troglodytes parvulus*) as well as our American species *ædon*, which is the only one he deals with in full, for the reason he was writing only on North American birds. He specified no type, and if he had not stated the inclusion of the European bird the mere fact that he took the specific name of the European species for his generic term would imply that he included it. In 1816 in his 'Analyse' (p. 45) he restricted *Thryothorus*, and made the type *arundinaceus*. Rennie in 1831 (*Montagu's Dict. British Birds*, 2nd. ed., p. 570), considering *Troglodytes*, a word meaning a cave dweller, not applicable for the Wrens called them *Anorthura*. This simple name substitution to suit Rennie's taste of course does not affect the type, and he made no restrictions whatever. We have then next to go to Prince Maximilian (*Beitr. Naturg. Bras.*, III, 1830, p. 742), who suggested *Hylemathrous* for a South American species, *T. furvus*, our House Wren *ædon*, and also included in his separation *Thryothorus arundinaceus* of Vieillot, which he considered = to *Cistothorus palustris*, and not as now understood, *T. ludoviciana*. This name *Hylemathrous* was also in 1860 accepted and restricted by Cabanis (*Jour. für Ornith.*, VIII, p. 406, 407).

Hylemathrous then being used for the House Wren leaves *Troglodytes* by elimination for the European Wren and our Winter Wren, which is congeneric with the European species.

Prof. Newton in his 'Dictionary' (p. 1051) in discussing this case says: "A few, who ignore not only common sense but also the accepted rules of scientific nomenclature, by a mistaken view of Vieillot's intention in establishing the genus *Troglodytes*, reserve that term for some American species—which can hardly be generically separated from the European form.—and have attempted to fix on the latter the generic term *Anorthura*, which is its strict equivalent, and was proposed by Rennie on grounds that are inadmissible."—REGINALD HEBER HOWE, JR., *Longwood, Mass.*

Nesting of the Great Carolina Wren in Connecticut.—"Come up here to-morrow morning and I will show you a bird's nest such as you never saw before in the State of Connecticut"—such was the tenor of the message which the mail brought me from Chester, Conn., last 15th of July, under the hand of Mr. C. H. Watrous, that stirred my oölogical instincts. I have a list of one hundred species whose nidification has fallen under my observation in Connecticut, and here was an offer to introduce to me No. 101. Of course I went, a passenger of the first morning train on the Valley Road, which left me on the station platform of that enterprising town which lies on the west shore of the Connecticut River, about ten miles from its mouth. It was not in the wild woods, as I expected, but